



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/994,635

11/28/2001

Alan H. Karp

10010485-2

7721

7590

03/21/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY

Intellectual Property Administration

P. O. Box 272400

Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SERRAO, RANODHI N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 03/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 27 October 2005 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6, 8-20, 22, 25, 26, 28, and 29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3. The applicant argued in substance the amended claims 1, 6, 8, 14, 19, 22, 25, and 26 and the newly added claims 28 and 29. The new grounds teach these and the added features. See rejections below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 19, 20, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ankireddipally et al. (US Patent 6,772,216).

6. As per claim 19, Ankireddipally et al. teaches a computer comprising; wherein said computer is connected to a registry storing a plurality of description files, each description file being customized for a particular service provided by a computer and describes a pattern of message exchanges expected to be followed and documents types expected to be used for communicating with the computer providing the service to utilize the service, said computer comprising the web service configured to access the registry; and publish a description file in the registry, wherein the description file describes a pattern of message exchanges expected to be followed and documents types expected to be used for communicating with the computer to utilize the web service (col. 11, line 56-col.12, line 21: wherein data store serves the function of a registry); a web service, said computer comprising the web service configured to communicate with another computer based on a plurality of interactions described in the description file (col. 11, lines 24-40), said plurality of interactions describing messages at least one of a message type to be received (col. 13, line 61-col. 14, line 12) and a message type to be transmitted to said another computer to facilitate said web service (col. 15, lines 39-57), wherein the message type to be received or the message type to be transmitted includes attributes describing data in a message that corresponds to the message type (col. 15, line 58-col. 16, line 9).

7. As per claim 20, Ankireddipally et al. teaches a computer readable medium on which is embedded a computer program, the computer program comprising: a plurality of interactions describing a plurality of messages to be received and/or transmitted

(Abstract and col. 6 lines 49-67), and at least one transition identifying the order of executing said plurality of interactions (Abstract and col. 7 lines 1-10).

8. As per claim 26, Ankireddipally et al. teaches a computer, wherein said message type to be received or transmitted comprises of an XML document (col. 20, lines 28-41).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

1. Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9-11, 14-18, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ankireddipally et al. and Meltzer et al. (2002/0165872).

2. As per claim 1, Ankireddipally et al. teaches a computer readable medium on which is embedded a computer program, the computer program comprising: accessing a registry storing a list of description files, each description file being customized for a particular service provided by a computer and describes a pattern of message exchanges expected to be followed and documents types expected to be used for communicating with computer to utilize the service; identifying a description file from the list of description files corresponding to a desired service (see Ankireddipally et al., col. 11, line 56-col.12, line 21: wherein data store serves the function of a registry); retrieving an identification of the description file, a location of the description file or the description file from the registry (see Ankireddipally et al., col. 12, line 64-col. 13, line 9), wherein the description file includes a plurality of interactions describing a plurality of messages to be received and/or transmitted (see Ankireddipally et al., abstract and col.

6 lines 49-67); and at least one transition identifying the order of executing said plurality of interactions (see Ankireddipally et al., abstract and col. 7 lines 1-10), the at least one transition including a source interaction of said plurality of interactions and a destination interaction of said plurality of interactions, said source interaction being executed prior to said destination interaction (see Ankireddipally et al., FIG. 6; wherein the source interaction is the Request message and the destination interaction is the Reply message and acknowledgements). But fails to teach said source interaction specifying a document type to be used in the source interaction; and determining whether a document is an instance of the document type to be used in the source interaction; and executing the source interaction in response to the document being an instance of the document type. However, Meltzer et al. teaches said source interaction specifying a document type to be used in the source interaction (see Meltzer et al., ¶ 121); and determining whether a document is an instance of the document type to be used in the source interaction (see Meltzer et al., ¶ 155); and executing the source interaction in response to the document being an instance of the document type (see Meltzer et al., ¶ 162). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ankireddipally et al. to said source interaction specifying a document type to be used in the source interaction; and determining whether a document is an instance of the document type to be used in the source interaction; and executing the source interaction in response to the document being an instance of the document type in order to allow systems and protocols to support transactions among diverse clients coupled to a network; and more particularly to systems and protocols to support

Art Unit: 2141

commercial transactions among platforms having variant architectures (see Meltzer et al., ¶ 3).

3. As per claim 2, Ankireddipally et al. and Meltzer et al. teach a computer readable medium on which is embedded a computer program, the computer program comprising: a plurality of interactions describing a plurality of messages to be received and/or transmitted (see Ankireddipally et al., Abstract and col. 6 lines 49-67), And at least one transition identifying the order of executing said plurality of interactions (see Ankireddipally et al., Abstract and col. 7 lines 1-10).

4. As per claims 3 and 4, Ankireddipally et al. and Meltzer et al. teach the computer program as claimed, wherein at least one interaction of said plurality of interactions is configured to select one message to be received or transmitted from a set of messages, said set of messages being included in said plurality of messages (see Ankireddipally et al., col. 8 lines 25-42; wherein depending on the interaction, the interaction protocol is configured to select a request-reply, publish-subscribe, or broadcast-multicast application-to-application message type structured in XML document format).

5. As per claim 6, Ankireddipally et al. and Meltzer et al. teach the computer program as claimed, wherein said at least one transition includes a triggering message of said plurality of messages, said triggering message invoking execution of said source interaction (see Ankireddipally et al., col. 7 lines 45-52; wherein the request message triggers a reply message in predetermined manner).

6. As per claim 8, Ankireddipally et al. and Meltzer et al. teach a computer program wherein said at least one transition includes a default transition (see Ankireddipally et

al., col. 14, line 43-col. 15, line 11: wherein a standard interface and a standard model serve the function of a default transition), said source interaction being executed when a message included in said source interaction that does not otherwise have a defined transition is received (see Ankireddipally et al., col. 20, lines 9-24).

7. As per claims 9, 10, and 11, Ankireddipally et al. and Meltzer et al. teach the computer program as claimed, wherein said plurality of interactions describe a plurality of message type in the form of XML schemas for said plurality of messages (see Ankireddipally et al., col. 5, lines 55-60; XML schemas are well known in the art at the time of the invention).

8. As per claim 14, Ankireddipally et al. teaches a computer comprising: wherein the computer is operable to access a registry storing a list of description files, each description file being customized for a particular service provided by a computer and describes a pattern of message exchanges expected to be followed and documents types expected to be used for communicating with the computer providing the service to utilize the service; identify the description file from the list of description files corresponding to a desired service (see Ankireddipally et al., col. 11, line 56-col.12, line 21: wherein data store serves the function of a registry); and retrieve an identification of the description file, a location of the description file or the description file from the registry (see Ankireddipally et al., col. 12, line 64-col. 13, line 9), a conversation controller generated from a description file, said conversation controller being operable to perform a sequence of interactions described in said description file, and said sequence of interactions includes at least one of receiving messages and transmitting

Art Unit: 2141

messages (col. 11, line 56-col. 12, line 21: wherein transaction service serves the function of a conversation controller, and col. 17, line 62-col. 18, line 9 and col. 12, lines 32-48). But fails to teach said description file including a document type for each interaction, the document type specifying a document to be used in the interaction, wherein said conversation controller is operable to determine whether a document is an instance of a document type for an interaction of said interactions and is operable to execute the interaction in response to the document being the instance of the document type for the interaction. However, Meltzer et al. teaches said description file including a document type for each interaction, the document type specifying a document to be used in the interaction (see Meltzer et al., ¶ 121), wherein said conversation controller is operable to determine whether a document is an instance of a document type for an interaction of said interactions (see Meltzer et al., ¶ 155) and is operable to execute the interaction in response to the document being the instance of the document type for the interaction (see Meltzer et al., ¶ 162). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ankireddipally et al. to said description file including a document type for each interaction, the document type specifying a document to be used in the interaction, wherein said conversation controller is operable to determine whether a document is an instance of a document type for an interaction of said interactions and is operable to execute the interaction in response to the document being the instance of the document type for the interaction in order to allow systems and protocols to support transactions among diverse clients coupled to a network; and more particularly to systems and protocols to support

Art Unit: 2141

commercial transactions among platforms having variant architectures (see Meltzer et al., ¶ 3).

9. As per claims 15 and 16, Ankireddipally et al. and Meltzer et al. teach a computer program as claimed, wherein at least one interaction of said plurality of interactions is configured to select one message to be received or transmitted from a set of messages, said set of messages being included in said plurality of messages (see Ankireddipally et al., col. 8 lines 25-42; wherein depending on the interaction, the interaction protocol is configured to select a request-reply, publish-subscribe, or broadcast-multicast application-to-application message type structured in XML document format).

10. As per claim 17, Ankireddipally et al. and Meltzer et al. teach a computer program as claimed, wherein said at least one transition includes a source interaction of said plurality of interactions and a destination interaction of said plurality of interactions, said source interaction being executed prior to said destination interaction (FIG. 6; wherein the source interaction is the Request message and the destination interaction is the Reply message and acknowledgements).

11. As per claim 18, Ankireddipally et al. and Meltzer et al. teach a computer program as claimed, wherein said at least one transition includes a triggering message of said plurality of messages, said triggering message invoking execution of said source interaction (col. 7 lines 45-52; wherein the request message triggers a reply message in predetermined manner).

12. As per claim 28, Ankireddipally et al. and Meltzer et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 14 above and Meltzer et al. furthermore teaches an instance (see

Art Unit: 2141

above ¶ 8 and also Meltzer et al., ¶ 166). However Ankireddipally et al. teaches a computer wherein said conversation controller is operable to generate an error message in response to the document not being the document type (see Ankireddipally et al., col. 20, lines 9-24).

13. Claims 12, 13, 22, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ankireddipally et al. and Meltzer et al. as applied to claims 1, 9-11, and 19-20 above, and further in view of Andrew Layman ("XML Schema NG Guide", Microsoft, May 1999), hereinafter referred to as Layman.

14. As per claim 12 and 13, Ankireddipally et al. and Meltzer et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 9-11 above but fail to teach said plurality of interactions include a location or a unique name for said XML schema wherein the location or the unique name includes a URL or URN. However, Layman, in an analogous art, teaches a location in the form of a URN for the XML schema (page 3 of 23, under "Types and Elements"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ankireddipally's and Meltzer et al. computer program with Layman's XML Schema to include the URN location, for the advantages of adding capabilities and flexibilities in XML (see Layman, page 1 of 23; Introduction).

15. Claims 22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ankireddipally et al. as applied to claims 19 and 20 above, and further in view of Andrew Layman ("XML Schema NG Guide", Microsoft, May 1999). Ankireddipally

Art Unit: 2141

teaches the computer as claimed, and suggested a internal and external registries to store XML schema but fails to explicitly state that said computer communicating with the computer comprising the web service based on the plurality of interactions described in the description file is connected to a registry storing a plurality of description files associated with a plurality of web services so that another computer can retrieve the description files containing at least one transitions and identified by a URN. However, Layman, in an analogous art, explicitly teaches a central registry identified by a URN storing a plurality of description files (XML schemas stored in an external location) so that other web service users can use them (page 3 of 23, under "Types and Elements"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ankireddipally's computer program with Layman's central registry for storing XML schemas, for the advantages of adding capabilities and flexibilities in XML (page 1 of 23; Introduction).

16. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ankireddipally et al. and Meltzer et al. as applied to claim 14 and 28 above, and further in view of Srivastava et al. (2002/0120685). Ankireddipally et al. and Meltzer et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 14 and 28 above but fail to teach a computer wherein an interaction error message in response to the document not being the instance of the document type is provided in the description file. However, Srivastava et al. teaches a computer wherein an interaction error message in response to the document not being the instance of the document type is provided in the description file


Art Unit: 2141

(see Srivastava et al., ¶ 476 and 479). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ankireddipally et al. and Meltzer et al. to a computer wherein an interaction error message in response to the document not being the instance of the document type is provided in the description file in order to warn the consumer that the execution of services following may behave abnormally after the occurrence of the warning (see Srivastava et al., ¶ 471).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571) 272-7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER